



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/796,048	03/10/2004	Hideki Kamada	249171US0	2720

22850 7590 08/25/2009  
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.  
1940 DUKE STREET  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER
----------

STEELE, JENNIFER A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1794

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

08/25/2009

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com  
oblonpat@oblon.com  
jgardner@oblon.com

<b>Advisory Action</b> <b>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/796,048	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KAMADA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> JENNIFER STEELE	<b>Art Unit</b> 1794	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 12 August 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
- The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
- Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.
- Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.
- Claim(s) rejected: 2-4, 9-12, 17-20, 23, 24 and 27-29.
- Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 5-8 and 13-16.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/J. S./  
Examiner, Art Unit 1794

/Elizabeth M. Cole/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant presented new claims 32 to 35 and the amendment will not be entered as the new claims require further search and consideration.

Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

Applicant states that claims 9-12 depend indirectly on independent claim 23. As written, claim 9 depends on withdrawn method claim 5 which is an independent claim and therefore the 102/103 rejection is considered proper. Claims 10-12 depend on claim 9 which is dependent on claim 5.

Claim 17 depends on withdrawn independent method claim 13 and not from claim 23 as stated. Claims 19 and 20 depend and claim 17 and the rejection is proper as these claims are not dependent on claims 23 or 24.

Applicant states that the rejection of the dependent claims over Toray and Ohmory should be withdrawn and Toray, Ohmory and Howard as the independent claims 23 and 24 were rejected over Toray and Ueda. The claims dependent on claims 23 and 24, which are 2-3, 27-28 and 30, are rejected under Toray and Ueda and dependent claims 4, 29 and 31 rejected over Toray and Ueda and Howard. One note is an error that claim 4 was not recited in the rejection statement with claims 29 and 31, however as claim 4 is identical to claim 29, it is understood that the rejection addresses this claim limitation.

Applicant's arguments that the rejection over Toray and Ueda is not proper as the fibers are not hydrolysis resistant and Ueda teaches a water soluble fiber. As stated in the arguments in the Final Office action of 5/12/2009, these arguments are not commensurate with the scope of the claims. Applicant has not claimed a hydrolysis resistant fiber and it is known in the art that PVA fibers can range in water solubility through partial or full hydrolysis and therefore hydrolysis or water resistance is not necessarily inherent to the PVA polymer and would depend from the process of producing the polymer.